

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 1, 2, 3, and 5. These sheets, which include FIGs. 1, 2, 3, and 5, replace the original sheets including FIG. 1, 2, 3, and 5.

In FIG. 1, descriptive labels have been added to labels 100, 104, and 106.

In FIG. 2, the label “SHELF 10” has been deleted and descriptive labels have been added to labels 200, 208, and 210.

In FIG. 3, descriptive labels have been added to 308 and 320, and label “PXE SERVER ADDRS 309” has been added.

In FIG. 5, descriptive labels have been added to labels 500, 502, 504, 506, 508, 510, 514, 516, 518, and 520.

Note, all amendments to the drawings are supported by the originally filed specification.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 8, 14, 15, and 23 are allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-28 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-22, and 24-28 presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15, 18, 20, and 22-28 are amended herein. Claims 2 and 14 are hereby cancelled without prejudice. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to for lacking descriptive function labels. While Applicants note that descriptive words are not required to be included in the drawings, Applicants have amended FIGs. 1, 2, 3, and 5 to include descriptive labels (where room permitted), as outlined below:

In FIG. 1, descriptive labels have been added to labels 100, 104, and 106.

In FIG. 2, the label “SHELF 10” has been deleted and descriptive labels have been added to labels 200, 208, and 210.

In FIG. 3, descriptive labels have been added to 308 and 320, and label “PXE SERVER ADDRS 309” has been added.

In FIG. 5, descriptive labels have been added to labels 500, 502, 504, 506, 508, 510, 514, 516, 518, and 520.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters “100” and “10” have both been used to designate “shelf” and reference characters “104”, “204”, and “500” have all been used to designate “boards.”

The label “SHELF 10” has been deleted from FIG. 2. While labels 104, 204, and 500, all refer to boards (e.g., board 104, board 204, and board 500), they do not all refer to the “same” board. Rather, labels 104, 204, and 500 refer to different embodiments, implementations, or representations of boards. Accordingly, different labels are not being used to reference the same item in the specification.

Specification

The title of the invention is objected to as being not descriptive. Applicants respectfully disagree.

“The title should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive and should contain fewer than 500 characters.” M.P.E.P. §606.

Applicants respectfully submit that the original title is brief, less than 500 characters, technically accurate, and descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants request that the original title be maintained.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5, 6, and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for inclusion of trademarks or tradenames. Accordingly, claims 5, 6, and 28 have been amended to address these concerns.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 101

Claims 24-28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, claims 24-28 have been amended to recite, “**tangible machine-readable medium...**” Furthermore, paragraph [0046] of the specification has been amended to delete the language stating that a machine-readable medium includes propagated signals.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 18-20, 24, 25, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yates et al. (US2004/0230866 A1).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Independent Claims 1, 18, and 24

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part,

determining a shelf address and a slot address of a board installed in a card modular platform, wherein the shelf address corresponds to a physical shelf of the card modular platform and the slot address corresponds to a physical slot location on the shelf of the card modular platform; and
automatically assigning a static network Internet Protocol (“IP”) address for at least one network port on the board **based on a combination of the shelf address and the slot address.**

Applicants respectfully submit that the Yates fails to disclose assigning a static network IP address based on a combination of a shelf address and a slot address of a board.

The Examiner cites paragraphs [0065], [0066], and [0067] of Yates as disclosing the elements of claim 1. These portions of Yates in fact state,

[0065] **The "Get Address Info" command can be used by the shelf manager 816 to look up the hardware address in the table using the FRU device ID as an offset.** In another example, the shelf manager 816 can use the command to computer the corresponding hardware address from the IPMB. (emphasis added)

[0066] **In addition to addressing individual locations within a shelf 808, the location of a shelf can also be addressed.** A "Get Shelf Address Information" command determines shelf address using a single byte of request data, the PICMG identifier. Response data of the command includes a completion code, the PICMG identifier, a shelf address type/length byte identifier, and shelf address bytes for the shelf containing the IPM controller 812. (emphasis added)

[0067] **A "Set Shelf Address Information" command can be implemented by the shelf manager 816 to enable configuration of the shelf address.** The "Set Shelf Address Information" command uses a single byte of request data, the PICMG identifier. Response data of the command includes a completion code, the PICMG identifier, a shelf address type/length byte identifier, and shelf address bytes for the shelf containing the IPM controller 812.

Accordingly, para. [0065] discloses that a GetAddressInfo command is used to look up a hardware address of a field replaceable unit (FRU) device using an FRU device ID, para. [0066] and [0067] disclose that individual locations within a shelf can be addressed and that the GetShelfAddressInformation command is used to determine the shelf address.

However, the mere fact that a hardware address of a FRU device can be looked up or that a shelf and individual locations within a shelf can be addressed, fails to disclose automatically assigning a static network IP address **based on a combination of the shelf address and the slot address.** In other words, the mere fact that a shelf or a

slot on a shelf can be addressed simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest assigning an address, much less a static IP address, based on the combination of the shelf and slot addresses. In contrast, Yates discloses addressing a shelf or an individual location within a shelf with the actual shelf address or the hardware address of the FRU device. Yates does not disclose assigning a static IP address that is created based on the combination of a shelf address and a slot address.

Since claim 1 now includes elements of claim 2 (now cancelled), Applicants will further address the Examiner's rejection of claim 2. The Examiner cites Harrison et al as disclosing static IP addresses. However, a reference that merely discloses static IP addresses does not disclose, teach, or suggest assigning a static IP address based on a combination of a slot address and a shelf address.

Consequently, Yates fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Independent claims 18 and 24 now include similar novel elements as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant §102 rejections of claims 1, 18, and 24 is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21, 22, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of French et al. (US 2002/0073249 A1).

Claims 2, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of Harrison et al. (US 2004/0177133).

Claims 10-13, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of Fassold et al. (US 2003/0088650 A1).

“To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Independent Claim 22

Amended independent claim 22 recites, in pertinent part, “wherein the IP address is assigned dependent upon the shelf and slot addresses and **independent of the PCB or the plurality of components on the PCB.**”

The Examiner acknowledges that “Yates does not explicitly disclose wherein execution of the machine obtains the static network address by performing a query on a lookup table using the shelf and slot addresses that are determined as inputs.” Office Action mailed 3/22/07, page 8. However, the Examiner cites French as disclosing “using the shelf and slot addresses that are determined as inputs [via MAC address associated].” Office Action mailed 3/22/07, page 9. However, using a MAC address to determine an IP address is not the same as using a slot and shelf address. The slot and shelf address are characteristics of the chassis into which a board is inserted, while the MAC address is a characteristic of the board itself. Therefore, the MAC address is not “independent of the PCB or the plurality of components on the PCB” as recited in claim 22.

Consequently, the combination of Yates and French fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 22, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant § 103(a) rejections of claim 22 be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 14 (now cancelled) deemed allowable by the Examiner. Accordingly, independent claim 10 now includes allowed subject matter.

Dependent Claims

The dependent claims are novel and nonobvious over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 102 and § 103 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice

of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Date: May 15, 2007

Cory G. Claassen
Reg. No. 50,296
Phone: (206) 292-8600